



MINUTES
General Education Assessment Committee
Friday, September 4, 2009
1:00 pm - 3:00 pm
ETA 101, Lake Worth

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| Attendance: | Louise Aurelien <input type="checkbox"/> | Jennifer Campbell <input type="checkbox"/> |
| David Childers <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Tcherina Duncombe <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Joseph Millas <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Karen Pain <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Ginger Pedersen <input type="checkbox"/> | Carole Policy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Syeda Qadri <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Terry Randolph <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Magdala Ray <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Matilde Roig-Watnik <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Helen Shub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Victor Slesinger <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Melissa Stonecipher <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Patrick Tierney <input type="checkbox"/> | Connie Tuisku <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Bobette Wolesensky <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | |

ITEM 1. Rubric Development

Discussion: Connie Tuisku began the meeting by asking for input from the committee about the Information Literacy outcome. The concern was that there might not be enough time for a student to demonstrate information literacy if it were to involve actually searching the Internet for information or reading documents to extract information. The committee made a number of suggestions as to how this could be achieved in a condensed format. It was also suggested that a question be added to the MAPP exam on information literacy to supplement what is collected in the scenarios. Ms. Tuisku and Louise Aurelian will continue to work on this rubric and bring a draft to the next committee meeting.

In reviewing the rubrics for some of the other learning outcomes, it became apparent to the committee that a decision needed to be made regarding how the scoring would take place. Several learning outcomes have multiple attributes. For example, the critical thinking rubric contains separate attributes for logical arguments, understanding of the problem, and the recognition of diverse values. The question before the committee was whether to grade each of these attributes separately or to grade them holistically.

After much discussion, the committee decided that it would be better to have more information rather than less, so it was decided to score each attribute separately. In this way, if a learning outcome is targeted for improvement, it will be possible to provide the results in a more specific way, e.g., rather than saying that students scored relatively low on the Communications outcome, the committee will be able to discern what aspect of communications (reading, writing, etc.) the students need to improve. It was also decided

that the language of the rubrics should be congruent with the language of the learning outcomes.

Data/data source: (where appropriate)

Action: Each group will review their rubric and make sure that the language of the rubric matches the language of the learning outcome. The revised drafts will be brought to the next meeting.

Meeting Adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Submitted by:

Helen Shub, Scribe